Exhibit 45

From:	Farmer, Stephen M <smfarmer@unc exchange.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, July 30, 2013 2:17 PM
To:	Kretchmar, Jen <jkretchmar@admissions.unc.edu>; Polk, Barbara Jo <bpolk@admissions.unc.edu>
Subject:	RE: NC Top 10% Diversity

Jen, thank you. Here's the summary that I provided to the folks who were drafting the amicus brief on behalf of the University. Steve

---

From: Kretchmar, Jen
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2013 10:15 AM
To: Farmer, Stephen M; Polk, Barbara Jo
Subject: FW: NC Top 10% Diversity

With regards to the public records request, this is the only related email thread I could find, but not sure this is what the amicus brief referenced. Steve, perhaps you did something in addition to this?

From: Kretchmar, Jen
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2012 3:15 PM
To: Farmer, Stephen M
Subject: RE: NC Top 10% Diversity

Hi Steve,

See below for predicted average first-year GPAs for the different groups of *admitted* students. I revised our most recent AI formula (developed using 2006-2010 data) so that it included an SAT CR/V + M score rather than the three separate subscores. That way I could calculate a predicted first-year GPA for everyone by converting ACTs to SAT equivalent scores. The third group is the subset of top 10% NC applicants we *actually* admitted this year...thought you might want to see that too.

	N	PGPA
Top 10% NC	4,179	3.1609
Actual NC Admits	4,954	3.2363
Top 10% NC actually admitted	3,194	3.2621

I've never developed a predicted graduation formula; is that something you want me to try to do?

Jen

PS. As a reminder, the AI formula includes SAT/highest test score, program, performance, and activity.

From: Farmer, Stephen M
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2012 12:34 PM
To: Kretchmar, Jen
Subject: RE: NC Top 10% Diversity

Jen, thanks so much. This is great.

Is there any way to project first-year performance and/or graduation rates based on the relative credentials of the two groups - actual admits/enrolls vs. projected admits/enrolls under a 10-percent plan?

EXHIBIT
tabbles
15
Kretchmar 3-7-17

UNC0080085

Probably not - but I thought I'd ask!

Steve

From: Kretchmar, Jen
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2012 10:09 AM
To: Farmer, Stephen M
Subject: NC Top 10% Diversity

Hi Steve,

I started playing around with this year's data and here's what I've found so far...

- There were 4,179 North Carolina applicants this year who were ranked in the top 10% of their high school class (using official rank only). Of these, we had already admitted 3,194 using our holistic review; a top 10% rule would lead to an additional 985 admits. When we throw this group into the yield model, and base our projections on 2011 yield, we could expect to enroll 2,868 of them, 519 of whom would be underrepresented (18.1%).

- When we throw our actual data in the yield model, here's where we stand: We made 4,954 NC offers of admission this year. Based on 2011 yield rates, we would expect 3,210 of them to enroll, 524 of whom would be underrepresented (16.3%). What it boils down to is this - there's a higher proportion of underrepresented minorities in the top 10% *we didn't* admit this year (236/985, 23.4%) than in the group we did admit (470/3,194, 14.7%)...

- Here are the average SATs of the various groups (using our new rules for which scores to include in the calculations):

    - 3,194 top 10% we admitted using holistic review: 1304
    - 985 top 10% we didn't admit this year: 1128
    - All top 10% (the two above groups combined)- 1262

    - Our actual NC admitted group (n=4,954) – 1317

Is this what you had in mind? Where would you like me to go from here?

Jen

UNC0080086

Our goal for the Fall 2012 first-year class is 3,960 students, including 3,247 from North Carolina. More than 10,000 North Carolinians applied. Fifty percent of those who applied were offered admission; 65 percent of those admitted will enroll.

The applicants from North Carolina included 4,179 whose high schools reported official class rank and who ranked within the top 10 percent of their graduating class.

Through the practice of comprehensive review described in our reading document, 3,194 of these students, or 76 percent, were offered admission. Of these students, 2,117, or 66 percent of those admitted, have accepted our offer of admission and will enroll next fall. These enrolling students will comprise 65 percent of the 3,247 North Carolinians in the entering first-year class.

If we had offered admission to all 4,179 of the top-10-percent North Carolinians who applied, our yield model projects that we would have enrolled an additional 751 students, increasing the number of top-10-percent students in the entering class to 2,868, or 88 percent of all North Carolinians enrolling.

A total of 379 spaces would have remained for the more than 5,800 other North Carolinians applied. Assuming that 65 percent of the students admitted from this group would have enrolled, we would have needed to offer admission to 583 students. The resulting admission rate for North Carolinians who did not officially rank in the top 10 percent of their graduating class would have been 10 percent, as opposed to a rate of 31 percent under comprehensive review. The students denied would have included hundreds of non-underrepresented minority students attending independent high schools and public magnet and suburban high schools—students who were admitted under comprehensive review.

A top-10-percent policy would have yielded a first-year class with a higher percentage of underrepresented students: 16 percent vs. 15 percent under comprehensive and holistic review. In effect, more non-underrepresented students would have been denied admission under a top-10-percent policy than under comprehensive and holistic review.

Under a top-10-percent policy, every academic indicator other than the share of the class ranking in the top 10 percent of the high-school class would have declined. For example, the average SAT (Critical Reading and Math combined) would have been 1262, as opposed to 1317 under comprehensive and holistic review.

The predicted GPA of the class after the first year at UNC would also have declined to 3.16 from 3.26 under comprehensive review.